



PTO/SB/21 (03-03)

Approved for use through 04/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL  
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

<b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b> (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/642,549	
	Filing Date	8/18/2003	
	First Named Inventor	RICHARD F. DECHANT	
	Art Unit	1614	
Examiner Name	MICHEL GRAFFEO		
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	16	Attorney Docket Number	—

**ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below):
<b>Remarks</b>		

**SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT**

Firm or Individual	RICHARD F. DECHANT
Signature	Richard F. Dechant
Date	

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: 8-8-06			
Typed or printed	RICHARD F. DECHANT		
Signature	Richard F. Dechant	Date	08/08/06

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 (1-800-786-9199) and select option 2.



A/C Number 10/642,549  
Art Unit 1614

Answer to Office Action Summary, 5/27/06, Examiner Michel Graffeo

35 U.S.C. 112

1. Enablement for the treatment of internal malignant tumors is accomplished by the absorption of the composition through sublingual and rectal tissues into the vascular and lymphatic systems and subsequently absorbed by the tumor(s). The malignancy in the tumor is killed immediately. The rationale is explained by the hypothesis that all cancers are caused by retroviruses. I indicated in the answer to the previous OAS that the product resulting from the reaction between resorcinol and camphor is resorcincamphorein. Evidently this compound is an extremely lethal anti-viral agent, and has no apparent adverse side effects on normal tissues. (See my enclosed paper "Cancer by Viral Infection"). Quoting from your OAS of 5/27/06, "The applicant does not have to prove that a correlation exists between a particular activity and an asserted therapeutic use of a compound as a matter of statistical certainty". Unfortunately I have not yet connected with clinical testing group. A double blind test for cancer seems rather dubious because it would require half the test group to give up their conventional treatment for the duration of test trials. According to the Food & Drug Administration undue experimentation or any experimentation should not be required to receive a patent. It is my understanding that a patent for an invention is the grant of a property right and not a guarantee of the efficacy of the invention. How many patents have been granted to large pharmaceutical companies that have turned out to be mediocre at the best and failures at the worst?

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

1. I have reported cases of cancer that were treated successfully with my composition. I did not set out to produce a composition for cancer treatment. Originally I was seeking an antiseptic to treat a "hospital staphylococcus" infection (MR Staphylococcus Aureus). By chance I discovered that the composition described in my application was extremely effective in treating malignant tumors. The first experience of its therapeutic value occurred when a raised lesion appeared on the back of my neck. My barber would shave the hairline on my neck, and in doing so would slice a small brown mole which would bleed. After a few months (I had a haircut every two weeks) my barber noticed a raised lesion where the mole had been and advised me to see a doctor. That night I applied the composition to the lesion thinking it was an infection (although there was no pain), and forgot about it. Within two days the lesion had disappeared. My second experience occurred when a pinhead sized brown mole, located on my left forehead grew to the size of pencil eraser and was irritating. For no explicable reason I applied the composition to the mole. The next morning, to my surprise, the mole was a mere shell that flaked away when touched. The third and confirming experience occurred when I sent a sample of the composition to my wife's friend in England who was suffering from Stage IV ovarian cancer and had only two to three weeks to live. She applied the composition and the cancer disappeared within two days. Her doctor described the phenomenon as a spontaneous remission.

2. I do not perceive even a hint of obviousness in selection of ingredients used in this composition since there was no original intent to produce a cancer treatment.

A/C Number 10/642,549  
Art Unit 1614

*Answer to Office Action Summary, 5/27/06, Examiner Michel Graffeo*

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

1. The patent application by Sheffer et al appears to cover a new and improved patch design. They include dozens of pharmaceuticals, chemical agents, medicines, and cosmetic ingredients to be used in conjunction with their patches. Am I to infer that all of the agents indicated in Sheffer's application will not be allowed in any future patent? Surely these agents have been included in earlier patents and published thousands of times in journals, books, and scientific papers.
2. The phrases "precancerous tissue" and "precancerous stages" appear to be contrived by Sheffer et al. *Precancerous is defined as "tending to become cancerous".* Neoplasms would probably fit this definition, but they are not classified as cancer. Tumors must be malignant in order to be classified as cancer. My composition treats malignant tumors and not "precancerous tissue".
3. Skin patches have been used by the medical profession for at least 40 years to deliver drugs such as morphine, and recently nicotine to the vascular system.
4. On page 11, [0039] Sheffer characterizes camphor as *either an analgesic or an antiseptic*. It is neither. They correctly characterize resorcinol and phenol as antiseptics, but if used with a patch either would cause nasty burns. About five years ago the U.S. FDA issued a paper listing agents that are no longer considered medically useful. Resorcinol and camphor are on that list. My composition does not contain any free resorcinol or camphor since they react completely to form the substance named "resorcincamphorein". This is the active ingredient in my composition.
5. Both camphor and resorcinol are classified as poisons (see Merck Manual or a text on toxicology). When used as Sheffer et al prescribe they would cause *serious illness or even death, since they would be absorbed into the vascular system*.
6. ppppppMy application specifies that the composition is administered by using saturated cotton swabs either topically or insertion in the rectum or under the tongue.
7. A product detail sheet, printed by Rex Eme Cream gives *information for use and lists ingredients*. The cream is applied to the skin and it contains resorcinol, phenol, camphor, menthol, etc.